App. No. 10/782,511
Amendment Dated: November 20, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 18, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 2 0 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed August 18, 2006 rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Timmons (U.S. Patent Application 2005/0050021). The Applicants note that the patent application number associated with the Timmons reference cited in the Office Action (2004/0205574) does not correspond to the Timmons reference. The Applicants have responded to the Timmons reference having an application number of 2005/0050021. Claims 1, 4, 5, 10 and 16 have been amended. No new matter has been added. The Applicants present the following for consideration.

Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner Lu for the courtesy of the telephone conference on November 20, 2006. The independent claims as amended were discussed with regard to the Timmons reference. No agreement was reached regarding patentability.

35 U.S.C. 101 Rejections

Claims 1, 4 and 16-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. The Office Action recites that Claim 1 and 4 includes language that is "intentional and may not actually perform to produce concrete, tangible or useful results." Claim 16 was rejected due to the fact that the term ""computer-readable medium" comprises wireless telecommunication signals and carrier waves, forms of energy." In response, claims 1, 4 and 16 have been amended.

App. No. 10/782,511
Amendment Dated: November 20, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 18, 2006

35 U.S.C. 102 Rejections

Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Timmons.

With respect to Claim 1, the Office Action recites that Timmons teaches "attempting to update the non-local collaboration data when a value associated with the locally stored collaboration data has been modified" (See Page 17, [0198] where contents in user's frames are dynamically updated by the message received from another frame)." The Applicants respectfully disagree but have amended the claim to more clearly define the invention and to further the prosecution of this matter.

Amended Claim 1 recites in part "determining when a web page that is associated with a collaboration service is accessed; wherein the web page includes a link that is associated with collaboration data that is stored in a non-local data store; and wherein multiple users perform operations on the collaboration data." Timmons, however, does not teach multiple users operating on collaboration data that is associated with a collaboration system. Instead, Timmons is directed at providing content to web pages in an effective manner. In paragraphs 68-78, Timmons provides an overview that discloses the use of portals which collect and combine information from a variety of sources such that the portal includes up to date information. The portlets disclosed in Timmons are also configurable to broadcast data to other portlets that are defined in the system. This helps to allow other portlets to receive the updated information in a timely manner. While Timmons may teach a system that provides up to date portal content, Timmons is not concerned with updating or making changes to the portal content.

App. No. 10/782,511
Amendment Dated: November 20, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 18, 2006

In contrast, Claim 1, as amended also recites "determining whether the operations performed locally are valid when a value within the locally stored collaboration data has been modified; and when the operations performed are valid then updating the non-local collaboration data in the non-local data store with the modified value." Timmons does not disclose determining whether or not an operation performed is valid and "then updating the non-local collaboration data in the non-local data store with the modified value." Instead, Timmons discloses portlets that listen for data and then populate a web page with the relevant data that is received through listening. Timmons is interested in obtaining content from different data sources and is not concerned with a client updating the portal content that is stored in the different data sources. Additionally, Timmons does not validate changes made to the data. Instead, Timmons is directed at providing up to date content. For at least the reasons presented above, the Applicants submit that Claim 1 is allowable as amended. Claims 2-9 depend from claim 1, and accordingly, are patentable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claim 10, as amended, recites in part "interact with the locally stored collaboration data without interaction with the server that is associated with the collaboration service; wherein the interactions include modifying a value in the locally stored collaboration data; and determining whether the interactions on the locally stored collaboration data are valid; and when the interactions performed are valid then updating the collaboration data at the data store with the modified value. In contrast, Timmons does not teach interacting with the "locally stored collaboration data without interaction with the server that is associated with the collaboration service." The portlets disclosed in Timmons are constantly looking for updates from the non-local data store such that the content of the portal remains up to date. This implies that there is

App. No. 10/782,511
Amendment Dated: November 20, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 18, 2006

interaction with a server whenever data changes that affects the current web page. As a result,

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 10 be withdrawn. Claims 11-15

depend from claim 10, and accordingly, are also patentable for at least the foregoing reasons.

As amended, Claim 16 recites in part "interacting with the locally stored collaboration

data without accessing the non-local collaboration data; wherein the interactions include

modifying a value in the locally stored collaboration data; and determining whether the

operations performed locally are valid when a value within the locally stored collaboration data

has been modified; and when the operations performed are valid then updating the non-local

collaboration data in the non-local data store with the modified value." As discussed above,

Timmons does not disclose determining when operations that were performed locally are valid or

updating data in the non-local data store. As a result, Applicants respectfully request that the

rejection of claim 16 be withdrawn. Claims 17-21 depend from claim 16, and accordingly, are

also patentable for at least the foregoing reasons.

App. No. 10/782,511
Amendment Dated: November 20, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 18, 2006

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be

allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is

respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application,

the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicant at the telephone

number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

Timothy P. Sullivan
Registration No. 47,981
Direct Dial: 206.342.6254

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
206.342.6200

27488
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE